DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 708 HE 022 849

TITLE	The Efficiency of Freedom. Report of the Committee on Government and Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 85
NOTE	57p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Quality; *Excellence in Education; *Government Role; Higher Education; *State Action; State Aid; *State Colleges; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Freedom; Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

A re-published version of the 1959 "The Efficiency of Freedom," Report of the Committee on Government and Higher Education is presented. After a 2-year study (designed to define relationships that should properly exist between public officials and state institutions of higher education, identify the principal areas in which state control over higher education has appeared to exceed proper limits, and suggest remedial lines of action) the Committee came up with a variety of findings that are as relevant to the panoply of relationships between state governments and public colleges and universities today as they were when "The Efficiency of Freedom" was originally published. If anything, the committee's insights carry more force in the mid-1980s than was true in an era when there were far fewer public postsecondary institutions, state bureaucracies were much smaller, and the federal presence on the higher education landscape could scarcely be discerned. Three chapters are as follows: (1) the tradition of freedom; (2) the growth of state control; and (3) avenues of reform (what higher education can do, and what the state can do in terms of legislatures, governors, budgeting, purchasing, auditing, personnel, and building). (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 211 708

aascu

SCUP DIGEST

1985/1

The Efficiency of Freedom

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✔ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

American Association of
State Colleges and Universities

HE 022 849

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE EFFICIENCY OF FREEDOM

THE EFFICIENCY

THE COMMITTEE:

Milton S. Eisenhower, CHAIRMAN
A. Boyd Campbell
The Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, C.S.C.
Margaret Clapp
Charles W. Cole
James B. Conant
Arthur S. Flemming
Clinton S. Golden
Virgil M. Hancher
J. L. Morrill
Herbert R. O'Conor
R. Sargent Shriver, Jr.
Edgar W. Smith
J. Russell Wiggins
Alfred H. Williams

Staff:

Malcolm Moos, DIRECTOR
Francis E. Rourke, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
Glenn Brooks, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE
Leo Redfern, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

OF FREEDOM

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION

FOREWORD

When the Report of the Committee on Government and Higher Education was first published in 1959, its positive effect on the morale of the public higher education community was instantaneous. In *The Efficiency of Freedom* beleagured trustees, administrators, and faculty members of state colleges and universities had, at long last, the equivalent of a declaration of independence, a statement around which they could rally in what was fast becoming an enhausting, protracted struggle with two expanding state governmental bureaucracies: the staffs of the legislatures where appropriations originated and those of the executive agencies charged with overseeing how the funds were spent.

Trustees and administrators felt that the states were chipping away at institutional autonomy, to a degree that endangered the integrity of the higher education enterprise. Faculty members were increasingly frustrated with the state-imposed red tape that seemed endlessly to entwine their travel requests and purchase orders. Complaints were common from public colleges and universities in many states that institutions of higher learning were regarded "at the state house" as being on a par or of a piece with the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Bureau of Public Works.

These concerns reached the officers of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, which established the committee under the chairmanship of the late Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, who had served as President of Kansas State University (1943-50) and of The Pennsylvania State University (1950-56), and, at the time the committee was formed, was President of The Johns Hopkins University. The staff director of the committee, the late Dr. Malcolm Moos, then a member of the

Johns Hopkins faculty, would later become President of the University of Minnesota.

The Efficiency of Freedom, and its larger, more detailed companion volume, a Staff Report entitled "The Campus and the State," coauthored by Dr. Moos and Dr. Francis E. Rourke, were watershed documents in defining the "relationships that should properly exist between public officials and state institutions of higher education," in identifying the "principal areas in which state control over higher education has appeared to exceed proper limits and thus to lead to unwarranted political or bureaucratic intrusion into educational policy," and in recommending "remedial lines of action" for the academic community, state legislatures, governors, and state agencies concerned with budgeting, purchasing, auditing, personnel, and facilities.

The committee's findings after two years of deliberation and study, so cogently expressed in its report, are as relevant to the panoply of relationships between state governments and public colleges and universities today as they were when *The Efficiency of Freedom* was published twenty-six years ago. If anything, the committee's insights carry more force in the mid-1980s than was true in an era when there were far fewer public postsecondary institutions, state bureaucracies were much smaller, and the federal presence on the higher education landscape could scarcely be discerned.

Today, virtually every state has one or more "systems" of public colleges and universities, operating under governing boards, which, in turn, are "coordinated"—some would say "regulated"—by agencies of the executive branch of the state government. This congeries of institutions and agencies produces tensions within the states even more divisive than those to which the committee addressed itself a quarter century ago. But the principles it spelled out on behalf of institutional autonomy *and* accountability, its admonitions to state officials and educators alike to achieve "a harmonious and fruitful working partnership" and "a renewal of confidence and mutual respect," and its balanced perspective on how the state must *help* the campus build administrative integrity and program quality—all are germane today as public colleges and universities strive to develop new levels of excellence in teaching, research, and community service.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities had not yet been founded when *The Efficiency of Freedom* was published; AASCU came into being two years later and will begin the celebration of its Silver Jubilee in November of this year. As a fitting prelude to that occasion, the Association is proud to reissue the Report of the Committee on Government and Higher Education in the hope that its prescience will once again influence the formulation of state policies affecting public colleges and universities.

Allan W. Ostar, President
AASCU
June 1985

Editor's Note: The Report of the Committee on Government and Higher Education was originally printed by The Johns Hopkins Press of Baltimore, Maryland, without copyright, so that it could be made available to any interested party. AASCU is reprinting the report because the University Press no longer has copies available.

Library of Congress catalog card no. 59-11781

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

In recent years, many educational leaders and informed observers of the American system of higher education have become convinced that the legal autonomy of governing boards of public colleges and universities is being eroded by an expansion of administrative supervision from the officers and agencies of state government. The concern of the educators became so strong that early in 1957 the Committee on Government and Higher Education was organized under the auspices of the Fund for the Advancement of Education to study the changing relationship between state governments and public institutions of higher education.

The hope was that a study by competent research scholars and an objective evaluation by the Committee would lead to improved relationships under which the essential freedom of each university would be fully protected while the legitimate fiscal, management, and program interests of state government would be equally safeguarded.

In the course of its deliberations, the Committee had three basic objectives:

(1) To define the relationships that should properly exist between public officials and state institutions of higher education. Here the Committee has been faced with the task of spelling out the scope and kind of control legislative bodies and executive officials can and should exert over colleges and universities without jeopardizing the independence and essential intellectual freedom of these institutions in carrying out their programs of education, research, and public service.

(2) To identify the principal areas in which state control over higher education has appeared to exceed proper limits

and thus to lead to unwarranted political or bureaucratic intrusion into educational policy or effective educational administration.

(3) To suggest remedial lines of action.

The Committee was unanimously agreed, as most thoughtful citizens are, that education must be free from political interference and from external controls which intrude upon educational policy. The Committee agreed, too, that effective, responsible management of the academic institution is more likely to result from giving authority to strong, able boards of lay trustees than by scattering managerial responsibility among various agencies of state government. Boards of trustees should of course have not only responsibility but accountability as well.

Throughout its considerations, the Committee found that it was called upon to differentiate between those governmental intrusions which are simply annoying to the institution's administrators or which may cause inefficiency in the management of the institution, and those which actually constitute interference in education. This was no easy task. The Committee became seriously concerned as its study progressed with the danger latent in the imposition of state controls. The line between a procedural nuisance which results in inefficiency and the actual infringement upon the educational autonomy of an institution of higher education is a difficult one to draw, but, if carried too far, the injudicious application of any control impinges upon the substance of education. Even the most routine administrative control, imposed harshly, may exact such a toll in the time, intellect, and energy of college officials as to diminish the quality of educational performance.

No firm trend can be detected in the activity of states in creating or invoking new controls over higher education. Today, the pattern is mixed. Thus, the removal of repressive controls in Massachusetts is encouraging, but elsewhere in the nation minor infractions of sound principle might well grow into serious difficulties. The possibility of interference is heightened by the fact that the financial resources of the states, on the one hand, and the physical and human resources of the institutions of higher education on the other are entering a period of stress. The likelihood of damage to higher education by the imposition of unwise controls is potentially far more than an idle fear.

The Committee has recognized that many new controls have been inspired by the worthy quest for greater efficiency in the over-all operations of state government; and certainly the citizens of a state have a right to expect that their governmental representatives will conduct the affairs of state in an efficient and economical manner. But the Committee

is convinced that freedom of education and efficiency in management are not incompatible, and that a system of free state colleges and universities, removed from even the suspicion of political influence, is a vital necessity in American society. In this report, the Committee has sought to reconcile the goal of efficiency in state government with the freedom required for institutions of higher education.

Obviously, progress toward improved state-university relations can come only from understanding by each party of the needs of the other. Institutions of higher education must avoid practices which may give rise to suspicion that their financial affairs will not bear critical scrutiny. State officials, for their part, must recognize that an elaborate system of controls over the internal affairs of colleges and universities paralyzes initiative, defeats the goal of efficient management, weakens the authority of governing boards, and threatens harm to the difficult and delicate enterprise of research and education. By law or tradition, independent lay boards of trustees are responsible for seeing to it that, within the resources provided, state colleges and universities satisfy the needs of the people in the whole field of higher education.

The Committee has confined itself to an investigation of the relationship between state government and state colleges and universities. It has excluded private institutions and junior colleges from the scope of its studies.[1] The Committee has not looked into the extent and character of the influence exerted over higher education by the federal government, by private pressure groups, or other external forces. Each of these other aspects of the continuing problem of freedom and control may deserve separate study by appropriate agencies.

In this report, in which the Committee offers comments, conclusions, and recommendations after a two-year study, no attempt has been made to document every assertion or to report fully on all the situations studied, for this is accomplished in the companion report of the research staff of the Committee.[2]

[1] So close is the relationship of public and private institutions of higher learning that it is possible for errors of omission to creep into any effort to study either in isolation. The Committee has kept this fact in mind. It agrees that since the private institutions perform significant public services, they have a right to expect from the state conditions favorable to their vigor and growth. However, the comments in this document are directed toward the central subject—the relations of the state to the *public* colleges and universities.

[2] Malcolm Moos and Francis E. Rourke, *The Campus and the State* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959). Hereafter this publication will be noted as *Staff Report*.

Members of the research staff traveled throughout the country, making on-the-spot studies in thirty-nine states. They conferred by personal interview, by correspondence, and in special meetings with government officials and educators in every state. Questionnaires were prepared and analyzed in six areas of major concern.[3]

The Committee itself, in addition to considering all the research evidence, heard in its several meetings the presentations of a number of expert consultants from both state government and education.

The purposes of this study have been in some measure realized already through the widespread discussions aroused by staff and Committee consultations. It is the hope of the Committee that the publication of this document and the findings of the research staff will provide a guide and a reference for those in state government and higher education who seek to work out specific problems in this difficult area and that it will serve as a means for eliciting the thoughtful consideration of others who may yet be unaware of the important principles at stake.

To expedite its work, and equally important, to assure the greatest objectivity in gathering of data, the Committee assigned sole responsibility to the research staff for its companion report. The Committee urges all who need or want to have an understanding of the results of this project to read not only this commentary and its recommendations but the separate *Staff Report* as well.

[3] Trustees of the state colleges and universities were asked for information about the role of trustees in higher education. Business officers of the state colleges and universities furnished detailed data on all varieties of state fiscal controls. The presidents of state colleges and teachers colleges were queried about special problems in their institutions. Presidents of the state universities were asked to comment on the nature of higher education. The attorney-general of each of the states was asked to furnish cases, opinions, and comments on the law of higher education. The governor of each state was queried about the growth of centralized administrative controls in his state.

CHAPTER I

THE TRADITION OF FREEDOM

IN ALL HISTORY, no nation has had a greater commitment to the value of education for all its citizens than has the United States. No other nation has depended so heavily on education for its economic progress and the achievement of its ideals. No other nation has made greater demands on its schools and its educators.

From the earliest days of the colonies, men and women sought, at great personal sacrifice, to provide education for their children. These first efforts were, of course, limited in scope. Soon, however, there developed also a concern for higher education, motivated principally by a desire to furnish cultural and religious training for those who would go into the ministry.

The sophisticated leaders among the nation's founders saw, and said eloquently, that this democratic experiment in self-government would not endure unless the ultimate guardians of liberty—the people themselves—formed an enlightened citizenry. If the people were to exercise the basic social power, they must have the capacity for critical reasoning and be well informed on a multitude of issues on which they would be called to express judgment. The passion for education which was evident then, and even earlier, has continued to be an animating characteristic of American society.

Both public and private educational institutions were born as a result of this deep-seated desire for learning. These two patterns

of education have flourished side by side, sharing common objectives and meeting obligations to the public which has provided them with support. One ideal to which American education became devoted is that, in keeping with the democratic concept that the welfare and dignity of the individual are paramount, each individual should be given the opportunity to develop his personal talents to the utmost.

Perhaps without awareness of the long-range implications of their attitudes, leaders of those early days acted in harmony with a principle which recent history has demonstrated in other parts of the world: When free education degenerates into indoctrination, it is no longer education at all. A school established as a center of indoctrination becomes a partisan political institution, subject to the capricious whims of those in power. Teaching and learning are smothered, and creative thought cannot flourish.

To the good fortune of our society, the early American schools were granted a great measure of autonomy, and the tradition then established has persisted. To be sure, local autonomy became the rule because of a reluctance to give the federal government additional powers, and independence for the academies of the day was granted to prevent their falling victim to the system of rule by political patronage. Whatever the origin of these practices, they have served to establish a sound tradition of institutional freedom.

Another peculiarly American characteristic of our educational tradition has been the responsiveness of American schools to the requirements and desires of the public. Early in our history, the need for practical as well as classical training found wide expression. The rapid economic and industrial development of the nation has always demanded more and more skilled persons. In addition to the cultural education which had been reserved for certain professions and the wealthy elite, individuals began to want training to equip them for a livelihood. Here again was developed a duality that is still present today in the curricula of nearly all of our colleges and universities. The concept of the university as an ivory tower has not in a true sense ever been applicable to American higher education.

During the last century, the idea of a state university as a capstone of the state's public educational system began to grow rapidly. This movement was given its chief impetus by the passage of the Morrill Act creating the land-grant system in 1862, but even before that time twenty-two states had created state universities.[4] Some of these state and land-grant institutions have grown to the stature of true universities, and many of them now are among the first rank in academic quality. Together with the most eminent private colleges and universities, they have rendered significant service to the nation through the training of students and through the development of new ideas, scientific knowledge, and technological improvements. In times of national peril, particularly during World War II, they have undertaken massive amounts of scientific and technological research in behalf of our national security.

In every field of human activity, their faculties and advanced students are probing into areas in which we are still ignorant, adding to man's store of knowledge and his understanding of his surroundings. From this free search for knowledge, motivated by an unquenchable human curiosity, flow developments of immeasurable benefit to mankind.

It is important to recognize a principle implicit here: Institutions of higher learning, whether public or private, serve both the end of knowledge itself, without regard for its immediate necessity, and the practical needs of the community. Thus, the importance of the colleges and universities to society can hardly be overemphasized. Without continuing research and a steady outpouring of graduates from these schools, the scientific and humane achievements of American civilization would soon perish.

To enable the state colleges and universities to discharge their responsibilities, both law and custom have traditionally assigned to these institutions a wide measure of independence. The state has recognized that higher education is a profoundly creative activity, involving as it does constant reinterpretation of old ideas and the creation of new knowledge. The end product of this

[4] P. F. Valentine (ed.), *The American College* (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1949), p. 17.

creativity necessarily defies measurement in purely quantitative terms; no other activity of the state involves such a multiplicity and complexity of interests as does a university, and no other exists so constantly in tension with established ideas. Thus it is that the activity of a university can be pursued only in an atmosphere of freedom and objectivity, its scholars beholden only to their own dedication to scholarship for the direction in which their findings lead them. It is their duty, as Socrates expressed it, to "follow where the argument leads."

This is not to say that university personnel are exempt from a responsibility to abide by high standards of integrity, behavior, and performance; but they should not be held accountable to political authority for the knowledge their researches develop, even if it is unpopular and discomforting. In this sense, they must be afforded unfettered intellectual freedom. To decide otherwise would be to stifle individual creativity and open the doors to requirements that scholars and students must follow popular doctrine without question. By definition, this would not be education, and it would violate those principles which are the dynamic of a democratic society. Had our forefathers not had this vision, we might still be bound by such archaic notions as the belief in witchcraft.

The founders of our colleges and universities, both public and private—sensitive to this need for intellectual freedom and the desirability of protecting faculties, students and administration of the institutions from interference—created governing boards of laymen to whom the responsibility for the welfare and perpetuation of the institution was entrusted. This tradition of trusteeship carried into the establishment of the land-grant colleges.[5] In creating their state university, six states have given constitu-

[5] Edward Danforth Eddy, Jr., *Colleges for Our Land and Time* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), p. 51: "In almost all states, the institutions were separated from the existing state government organization. A separate board of trustees was created, responsible to the state administration and legislature. This was a significant action in the early days. Historically, by and large, it has prevented political control and influence and has kept state-supported higher education sufficiently isolated from the machinations of changing political regimes."

tional autonomy to the institution for the purpose of protecting it from caprices of public or political interference and from having to accept staff appointments on the basis of political patronage. In yet other states, autonomy has been given to the university by legislative act. The courts have been eloquent in supporting such devices of protection.[6]

All of these means of providing autonomy were clearly in support of a conviction that freedom and independence are essential to a vigorous and productive system of higher education.[7]

The placing of full responsibility for the university's affairs, as a public trust, in the hands of an independent board of lay trustees or regents stands in sharp contrast to the British system of leaving the university under the control of its faculty, or the Continental system of placing it directly under the control of a government minister. In America, the British system has never been thought to be capable of winning public favor and support, and the Continental system would expose higher education directly to the threat of political interference.

The lay board of trustees, working with the president of the university, and through him with the faculty, to promote

[6] For example: *State* v. *Chase*, 175 Minn. 259, 220 N.W. 951 (1928): "The purpose of the Constitution remains clear. It was to put the management of the greatest state educational institution beyond the dangers of vacillating policy, ill-informed or careless meddling and partisan ambition that would be possible in the case of management by either Legislature or executive, chosen at frequent intervals and for functions and because of qualities and activities vastly different from those which qualify for the management of an institution of higher education."

[7] In 1953, the Association of American Universities made an excellent statement on "The Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and Their Faculties," which included this comment: "Free enterprise is as essential to intellectual as to economic progress. A university must therefore be hospitable to an infinite variety of skills and viewpoints, relying upon open competition among them as the surest safeguard of truth. Its whole spirit requires investigation, criticism and presentation of ideas in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual confidence. This is the real meaning of 'academic' freedom. It is essential to the achievement of its ends that the faculty of a university be guaranteed this freedom by its governing board, and that the reasons for the guarantee be understood by the public. To enjoin uniformity of outlook upon a university faculty would put a stop to learning at the source."

educational and research programs and management efficiency, can play a decisive role in protecting the university from improper public or political intrusion. Depending on a strong and able board of lay trustees has proved to be the most efficacious means of placing authority and responsibility in the same hands and of keeping programs responsive to the changing needs of society. Any interference with policy or program decisions from outside this lay governing board diminishes its effectiveness and threatens to encourage partisan or bureaucratic interference. For the trustees to be assigned, and to assume, sole responsibility for seeing that the institution's affairs are well managed seems to the Committee the surest practical way to maintain not only the necessary climate of freedom but the institution's essential independence as well.

Intellectual freedom and institutional independence can hardly be separated. The climate of freedom in which teaching and learning flourish is dependent upon attitudes and conditions within a free institution which encourage rather than limit the intellectual activity of those within the university community. When either bureaucracy or partisanship infringes upon the authority of the governing board, it thereby threatens both the intellectual and institutional independence of the institution. Intellectual freedom may suffer seriously if public colleges and universities are subjected to the same controls as other state activities. Conversely, protecting the authority of boards of lay trustees from interference by the state is every bit as vital to the freedom of the university as is the preservation of freedom for teaching and research.

The members of this Committee further believe that insuring independence and freedom for institutions of higher learning is neither inimical to efficiency in state government nor an invasion of the prerogatives of other, but distinctly different, governmental agencies. The Committee is quite convinced that in states where the colleges and universities are not granted constitutional autonomy, society will best be served if state officials and the public take steps to treat the institutions as though they did have such guaranteed autonomy. For this reason it has recommended, at a later point in this report, a review of the laws applying to

higher education and has suggested changes to bring about this improvement.

Higher education, by its very nature, is one of the most controversial of all activities. Sometimes criticism is merited. A cynic once remarked that the only thing worse than a free press is a controlled press. With the exaggeration eliminated, the thought might also be applied to education. But occasional errors in judgment, or infrequent capricious actions by a few, must not obscure the truly overwhelming fact that education has the unique function of conserving, disseminating, and advancing the collective wisdom of society. It is a creative, individualized service, performed for the benefit of all the people, both within and outside the boundaries of the state.

In contrast to other state activities, the university has no limiting boundaries. It is a part of a scholarly community, drawing knowledge and inspiration from other similar institutions, and contributing to the whole. It competes for professional personnel in a national and even world market. In some states, higher education is exempted from statutory controls imposed on all other sectors of the state administration in acknowledgment of the fact that because of its uniqueness of function it requires unique status in the total complex of governmental activity.

It has been argued that a university need be autonomous only in the scholarly phases of its operation, that so-called nonacademic activities can be externally regulated without risk to educational integrity. But the demonstrable fact is that virtually every activity on a college campus has academic implications. What is more, the Committee's study has clearly disclosed that imprudent intervention of state agencies into ostensibly nonacademic areas can quickly penetrate to educational policy.

We would be deficient in our duty if we did not emphasize the dangers inherent in any such trend. Educational institutions reach the summits of greatness only by long and arduous efforts. While other activities of the state may be improved by rapid administrative reform, the university must build its greatness and its efficiency over decades. A college or university damaged by arbitrary state intervention bears wounds that harm succeeding generations of students and scholars.

The Committee, of course, has been sensitive to the goals of efficiency in state government and the need for sound management in college and university activities. Frugality in the use of educational resources is obviously imperative. This is and must be the responsibility of the university trustees, and they must hold themselves accountable to the state government for assuring that every reasonable effort is made to achieve this goal.

Since medieval times, when the independent university first appeared, it has survived many challenges to its independence, not the least of which has been the effort of political authorities to force it into conformity with the conventional wisdom of the day. Each intrusion, even if a minor one or made with beneficent intent, is erosive. Thus, an enlightened society must be alert to them at the outset, and attitudes and practices must be built which will regard all intrusions as unwise and impossible. For legal protections will stand to little avail before waves of public intolerance. The public and its representatives must have a genuine understanding of the mission of higher education and its need for freedom. An atmosphere must exist in which the scholar gains respect and the public recognizes that, as Whitehead put it, "the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed."

At this time in history, it is not overstatement to say that our very survival depends upon excellence in higher education. We look to our institutions of higher learning for the scientists, technologists, doctors, teachers, cultural leaders, and businessmen who keep our society viable. We look to them for the ever-increasing numbers of persons trained to creative levels needed in every field of knowledge; and it is to them that we look for the fundamental research which leads to our advance in all fields of human endeavor.

The reasons for guaranteeing the security of higher education and keeping it firmly anchored against the winds of intolerance and momentary folly ought to be familiar to all who recognize the pre-eminent position of the university as a citadel of freedom. But, as a wise philosopher said years ago: "While everything there is to say has been said before, since no one listens, we must say it again." This case too is one that needs to be stated with every change in setting.

CHAPTER III

THE GROWTH OF STATE CONTROL

WHILE OUR NATION adheres generally to the belief, firmly implanted in our legal and political traditions, that higher education should be free from political interference, nonetheless, in recent years a new threat to the corporate autonomy of state colleges and universities has emerged. In a number of states, fiscal and management controls have been imposed upon institutions of higher learning, and sometimes these have tended to undermine the authority of institutional governing boards.

In some states, college and university expenditures are subjected to close supervision by various state officials—budget officers, controllers, purchasing agents, and more recently through the activities of legislative auditors—leading in many instances to administrative limitations which amount to a usurpation of the responsibility of university governing boards. Research evidence indicates that the continuous involvement of noneducational officials in the internal affairs of higher education could easily become more serious.

The growth of state administrative controls has stirred anxiety among college officials. They have taken public notice of the encroachment of state authority upon the independence of college governing boards, and a mood of apprehension is evident even in areas where tight control has not yet penetrated. Many educators fear that controls developed in other states will be imitated by their own state governments, or they see the practice of oppres-

sive controls elsewhere as encouragement to their own state officials to exercise powers long dormant. Even when efforts to impose unwarranted controls are repulsed, the experience leaves a legacy of uncertainty.

To be sure, not all these fears are warranted. Events have not always borne out the apprehensions of college officials. In many regions the public holds higher education in such esteem that political intrusion upon the universities' independence would not be tolerated. But in some states, such as Kansas, Iowa, and Massachusetts, administrative controls have at times cut deeply into the internal affairs of higher education. This issue has emerged in a dramatic form in West Virginia, where the state auditor has exercised a veto over such matters as sabbatical leaves[8] and the use of private gifts by public universities and colleges. Fears of college officials may sometimes be excessive, but they are never altogether without foundation.

The source of the tensions existing between many colleges and the states can be found in current trends in state government.

The cost of supporting all state services has been steadily rising, as has the cost of higher education. This has spurred legislatures to search for ways to obtain a maximum return on each dollar appropriated. State expenditures have more than tripled in the postwar years—rising from $7 billion in 1946 to more than $24 billion in 1957. In 1946, expenditures by public institutions of higher education stood at $397,000,000; by 1957, they had undergone nearly a fivefold increase to $1,958,000,000.[9] In the face of these rising costs, the quest of the states for economy and efficiency has taken on new urgency.

While attempting to find new sources of income to meet rising costs and increased demand for services, state legislatures have

[8] The auditor was overruled by the state supreme court. *State ex rel West Virginia Board of Education* v. *Sims*, 81 S.E. 2d 665 (1954). See *Staff Report*, Chap. 5.

[9] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Compendium of State Government Finances in 1957* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958) and *Revised Summary of State Government Finances: 1942–50* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951).

understandably endeavored to tighten supervision of expenditures. They have sought to strengthen detailed oversight of state spending, which in some states has included creation of new supervisory techniques. For example, where systems of centralized fiscal control are already well established, the authority of budgeting, purchasing, and other fiscal officials has been expanded; preauditing of expenditures has been initiated, and building agencies to monitor capital construction programs have been established. Simultaneously, legislatures have moved to broaden their own powers of fiscal supervision through the use of interim committees, legislative auditors, and other mechanisms for controlling expenditures.

However, it is not only financial pressure which has brought new controls into higher education. Both the theory and practice of state administration have undergone considerable change in recent years. It was once traditional for each state agency to be given a large measure of autonomy. Decentralization was then the philosophy of administration. But over the years, the conviction has spread that efficiency demands a tightly knit system of administrative centralization, with direction and control imposed from above.

The practice of this philosophy of centralization has pointed implications for the traditional independence of state colleges and universities. Many state officials believe that institutions of higher education should be brought under the state's system of uniform administration. Influential state officers argue that if central controls can be applied successfully to such activities as highways, conservation, and other regular state programs, they are equally valid for higher education.

Beyond question, centralized budget-making is the most powerful of the devices created as instruments of central control. With the development of the executive budget, the judgments of the state budget agency may have a decisive effect upon the decisions of the governor and the legislature on appropriations for higher education.

Nobody doubts the need for an executive budget, for only thus can prospective revenues and expenditures be foreseen and

brought into balance, along with a balancing of priorities among competing demands for funds. But if the budget director seeks to determine priorities within the educational budget, serious consequences follow. Though this sometimes occurs, the executive budget process has not proved nearly as controversial as central purchasing, pre-auditing, and other techniques which give state officials, rather than the university president and his trustees, decisive authority to determine each financial transaction of colleges and universities. It is these administrative devices, externally imposed, which have raised the greatest threats of governmental intrusion into the internal affairs of institutions of higher education.

Viewed from a management perspective alone, it violates the canons of sound administration for a college governing board to be vested with legal and public responsibility for the conduct of educational affairs while the real decision-making power resides at some remote spot in the state bureaucracy. The maxim that authority should be commensurate with responsibility is grossly violated on a campus where routine decisions on financial matters are in fact made by a state official. Carried to an extreme, as it has been in some places, such a system of remote control denies to governing boards and college presidents the power they are intended and entitled to have. In such a situation, public officials who may be ill-equipped to make educational decisions are moved into a position where they govern higher education without bearing any visible responsibility for its success or failure.

Bureaucratic encroachment becomes especially vexing when decision-making which involves institutions of higher learning is placed in the hands of government officials at low echelons of authority within the administrative hierarchy. In some states a budget examiner rather than the governor or even the budget director makes the real decisions on appropriation recommendations for colleges and universities; minor officials in auditing, purchasing, and other state offices similarly sometimes make decisions affecting the educational program.

It is fair to say that a system of administrative centralization gradually opens up channels through which political influence over higher education can flow. Certainly, for example, the free-

dom of education has begun to diminish when a state auditor or personnel officer gains control over faculty appointments, or salaries to be paid, or the publication of research findings. Even if initially restricted to purely housekeeping considerations, state fiscal and management controls have a tendency to expand in scope, to limit institutional freedom, and to spill over into matters of educational policy. Important educational policy decisions are often made through approval of expenditures or allocations of funds.

Certainly a distinction between housekeeping and substantive controls is impossible to maintain once a state official has actually begun to intervene in the management of the university. A budget officer with the power to rule on the salary to be received by a professor or the allocation of appropriated funds for educational purposes, inevitably, in exerting this power, is deciding on matters of educational as well as fiscal policy.

Apprehension over the growth of state administrative control is heightened by the fact that educators at some institutions frequently face the possibility of partisan political interference in academic affairs. Pressures are still applied to bring about the discontinuance of research projects that offend vested political interests or, similarly, to discharge a faculty member who has incurred the displeasure of some powerful political leader.[10]

Fortunately, in many states public opinion provides a check against the worst excesses of political interference with the state university. But state colleges and universities by their nature must live in close proximity to the political process, if for no other reason than that they derive their financial support from state funds. In view of this fact it is easy to understand why patterns of administrative supervision that seem innocuous on the surface can produce profound disquiet among educators.

[10] In one state a professor developed a formula for determining the valuation on leased farm lands that would have been disadvantageous to vested agrarian interests. Some legislators denounced the publication of the research monograph and urged the regents to withdraw the publication. For another example, the efforts of Governor Eugene Talmadge to discharge a dean at the University of Georgia in 1941 attracted nationwide attention. For further discussions of political pressure, see *Staff Report*, Chap. 10 and Chap. 11.

It is clear that the executive budget and some other reforms aimed at insuring efficiency will be permanent features of state government. Fiscal co-ordination is considered a necessity today, as mounting costs of state government force an abiding concern for economy upon all responsible public officials. Higher education, as well as other sectors of society, will benefit from a modern system of budgeting which allocates scarce dollars in terms of rational calculation rather than in response to pressures. (In this age of technological advance, a high priority for higher education is virtually assured under any well co-ordinated plan for allocation of state financial resources.)

However, not every governmental reform put forward in the name of economy and efficiency will accomplish these desirable ends. It is one thing to agree that a state budget office should have the power to scrutinize all requests for financial support so that it can tie together the governor's recommendations to the legislature in a unified executive budget; it is quite another to suggest that any fiscal agency of state government should be set up—or should assume power—as overseer of the financial transactions of colleges and universities. A fiscal officer cannot have judgments superior to and more dependable than those of the college executive and governing board on how appropriations, once made, should be spent to promote the academic goals of the institution.

Budgetary and auditing procedures designed to keep the public continuously informed about the disposition of public funds are of course indispensable. It cannot be denied that there is a growing need for co-ordination of the broad range of activities necessarily undertaken by state government today. However, the competence required to do these things is quite different from the skill required to run a university. To their credit, it must be said that thoughtful fiscal officials as well as college administrators have been aware of the tendency of fiscal controls to overreach their proper limits.[11]

[11] Arthur Naftalin, Commissioner of Administration for the State of Minnesota, has aptly defined the legitimate scope of such controls in a statement before the Committee: "I should divide the problem of fiscal control over state-supported higher education into two parts. First there is the initial question of what portion of a state's resources should be devoted to higher

Across the country—Minnesota, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Rhode Island are cases in point—increasing support is being won among state officials for the view that, once the state machinery is employed to determine what share of the state's financial resources shall be allocated to higher education, and the appropriation has been made, the management of expenditures shall be the responsibility of the university. Through its governing board, the university shall in turn be held accountable for the wise and frugal use of these public funds in meeting the academic goals of the institution.

Unfortunately, this view is not yet universal.

A major obstacle to improving relations between state and higher education seems to be that many officers in both areas are convinced that any compromise on their part will swiftly undermine their entire position.

Some educators believe that all forms of interest by state administrators in the affairs of higher education are suspect and will eventually bring higher learning under political control. Carried to an extreme, this view would lead to the untenable conclusion that the state has no right to inquire into the use to which public funds are put in operating institutions of higher education.

Many state officials, too, believe that compromise is not possible. In their view, higher education should be treated no differently from any other state activity. They contend that any exemption granted to institutions of higher education would cause other

---

education, and second, the expenditure and internal allocation of the state support once it has been voted. With respect to the first stage I believe this is wholly, appropriately and inescapably within the jurisdiction of the governor and the state legislature. This determination is inevitably a political one and, under our constitutional system, must be made with responsiveness to the public will as expressed in our democratic elections. But with respect to the second stage, once the elected representatives have spoken, fiscal control should become the responsibility of the academy itself, as represented and symbolized by the regents or trustees or college board. It should be their responsibility to determine how the limited resources available shall be distributed among the infinite number of competing academic needs. To impose upon this process the will and direction of state fiscal officers constitutes an encroachment that is potentially extremely dangerous."

state agencies to demand similar status. State officials in Massachusetts, for example, though recognizing that personnel controls of the kind formerly applied to the university defeat the very purpose of an efficient recruitment program, nonetheless now fear that the recent passage of the "Freedom Bill" relieving the university of these controls will soon lead to pressure for at least equal independence by other state agencies.[12]

Rigidity in these matters can of course stalemate efforts to achieve mutual understanding or compatible working arrangements between the state and the institutions of higher education.

Many of the controls imposed on colleges and universities are unsound not only from the standpoint of higher education but also from that of state government.

In the field of personnel management, for example, the objections college officials have made to the expanding web of civil service regulations are similar to those voiced by an important segment of the personnel profession. Personnel experts have long been working to trim away some restrictive practices in modern civil service programs. They hold that state governments must keep pace with the modern trend, which is to assign greater responsibility to operating agencies for the management of a successful personnel program.

Another example is afforded by the trend to administrative centralization. Some degree of centralization may promote efficiency, but experts acknowledge that the "architects of orderliness" may go too far and thus sap the vitality and initiative of the state service agencies. Sprawling decentralization was a problem in the past. Excessive centralization may well be the problem of the future.

Further, the tendency of some legislatures to intervene in the details of college and university administration is not sound even from the perspective of governmental efficiency. Occasionally, intrusions have come about through legislation which places certain curricular, admission, or research requirements upon the univer-

[12] For an extensive discussion of the Massachusetts case, see *Staff Report*, Chap. 7.

sity. Again, permanent legislative agencies have introduced fiscal controls that often duplicate the activities of budget officers and auditors.

College officials do not question the right of legislatures to determine the kind and amount of public higher education the state shall have, or the legislature's continuing responsibility for determining what share of the state's income can be allocated to the colleges and universities. They feel strongly, however, that a legislature defeats the purpose of efficient government when it makes detailed judgments on matters of curriculum and research,[13] freezes into statutes admissions policy and other matters requiring flexibility, or, in an effort to insure the honesty and legality of all administrative transactions, sets up a multiplicity of "watchdog agencies."[14]

Educators know that such all-embracing supervision is a recipe for institutional mediocrity in the field of higher education. Competent administrators and productive scholars will simply not be attracted to serve in an institution where their work will be hampered by bureaucratic controls and where the power of decision is taken away from them. Further, excessive surveillance causes a climate of administrative caution and academic inertia which can only result in a second-rate institution.

A point which educators must make persuasively to the public and its elected representatives is that economy and efficiency can be realized in public institutions of higher learning without the intervention of noneducational officials.

Certainly public support for the continued independence of

[13] Unfortunately, colleges themselves are sometimes responsible for this unhappy situation. A department of the institution, believing itself to be under-financed, may appeal to pressure groups and others for support—a support which at times is expressed in terms of legislative riders or special earmarked appropriations.

[14] In a summary statement urging improvement of the system of higher education in 1947, The President's Commission on Higher Education said: "Flexibility must be preserved; rigidity of administration avoided. In all efforts to improve higher education, freedom—the cornerstone of democracy—must be the cornerstone also of the structure within which higher education operates." *Higher Education for American Democracy*, Vol. III, p. 68.

higher education will be forthcoming only where the public has confidence that the budgeting, accounting, and reporting procedures truly reveal the fiscal operations of the institution. In some states, public confidence in the ability of colleges and universities to handle their own fiscal affairs is lacking.

This may be partly a result of the timeworn view that academic people are not competent in business matters. Yet this stereotype is largely irrelevant today when many college administrators have a background of managerial experience which compares favorably with that to be found in any other area of government or industry. Indeed, many colleges and universities are models of efficient management, and members of their staffs are increasingly consulted and recruited for governmental agencies.

On the other hand, the record of fiscal mismanagement at a few institutions has done much to discredit educational administration, not only in their home states but across the country. Wide circulation is given to stories of isolated cases in which colleges have been guilty of laxity in the use of funds, or of making expenditures in apparent disregard of legislative intent, or wasteful "empire-building." What happens in one state often affects the esteem in which higher education is held in other parts of the country, and the temptation is strong for political office holders to take stern measures, in advance, to prevent such occurrences.

Sometimes, colleges have brought down difficulties upon their own heads. Among the criticisms of college operations voiced by state officials, perhaps none is more frequent than that these institutions tend to be uncommunicative about their finances. Secrecy in the use of public funds breeds suspicion and gives rise to the impression that the colleges are doing something they do not want the public or state officials to know about. Many state officials assert that fiscal control would less often be needed if the schools were candid and responsive in supplying requested information.

It must be said that colleges and universities have much to learn about communicating to the public facts regarding their finances. They also must do better than heretofore in convincing the public that higher education is a unique public function which withers in an atmosphere of control.

The issue of state control over colleges and universities has come to the fore at a time when the American system of higher education is undergoing rapid structural change. One important development is the emergence of the state college system. In many states, teacher training institutions have progressed beyond their normal school traditions and have emerged as liberal arts institutions. Historically, the governance of higher education has been characterized by a double standard under which large state universities have been granted a substantial degree of administrative independence while "normal schools" have been under stricter control. This stems in part from the fact that in many places the colleges have grown up under the state department of public education and are administered as extensions of the elementary and secondary school system. Some educators and state officials also point out that teachers colleges have not ordinarily had the range, scope, and complexity of tasks in teaching and research that exist in large universities, and some have not achieved the levels of excellence of a university. Some do not have staffs of the size and specialization necessary to sustain them in a position of administrative autonomy. Many smaller schools have found budget officers and state purchasing agents of great help in their own management, and some educators in these institutions confess that it would not be possible for them to guarantee the high quality of educational program and faculty appointments which would entitle them to true university status.

But with their expansion, some state colleges now seek commensurate improvement in status. In California, for example, leaders of several state colleges say that their institutions have outgrown the need for close control.[15] The resentment against excessive supervision is often directed toward state boards of education, where many educational policies are laid down, as well as toward the management agencies of state government.

[15] One California state college president pointed out in a letter to the Committee that his institution was nearing an enrollment of ten thousand full-time students. "We feel," he said, "that we are in a bad position with regard to state budget controls, civil service regulations, and building controls. . . . I believe the Council of State College Presidents as a whole would feel we could operate more efficiently if we had greater autonomy."

The executive officers of some state colleges maintain that when the small institutions have reached a mature level, their administrative status should be made commensurate with their academic function. Thus when a teachers college has achieved the quality and level in its academic program which is expected of a university, when it has demonstrated capability of sound management, and when it can attract and retain a faculty of high quality, it should be granted the freedom and autonomy to which a university is entitled.

Many presidents of these small colleges insist that strict control imposed by state government hampers their attainment of high standards in education, and they say that therefore, at the very least, the state should be liberal in its administration of control devices.

Across the country, more rapidly in some regions than in others, a movement is afoot to achieve greater co-ordination of academic activities among colleges and universities. The feeling seems to be that many schools, particularly the smaller institutions, engage in expensive and wasteful duplication of effort. Increasingly the point is made that unless colleges and universities take the initiative in working out a system of voluntary co-ordination, the legislature will undertake this task or delegate it to a state agency.

In eight states the pressure for co-ordination has led to the establishment of co-ordinating boards for higher education, sometimes referred to as "super boards" or "master boards." The imposition of these boards over the traditional governing structure of institutions presents a delicate problem of balance in the government of higher education.[16] Many educators are watching their growth with anxiety.

[16] States with master boards, that is, boards which co-ordinate higher educational programs but do not replace individual governing boards, are: New Mexico, New York (although the New York board governs directly in the case of several institutions), North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin. The North Carolina master board has been engaged in a dispute with the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina over proper spheres of authority. As of March, 1959, it appeared that a settlement was in the making. See *Staff Report,* Chap. 9.

Two problems here merit continuing study: the first is whether the master board can perform the task of co-ordination without intruding in matters that lie properly within the jurisdiction of the governing boards of individual institutions. The second concerns the possibility that a co-ordinating agency may have a levelling effect—that is, it may influence all institutions it serves to move toward an average standard. Where this occurs, the best colleges and universities are pulled down while the worst are lifted up, and thus valuable models of excellence may be sacrificed to standards of uniformity.

Generally, external controls and political interference result directly in a lowering of quality. In a talk with state officials, a college president warned lest the state "unwisely make a move which would attempt to make of [the] university just another state department. If you succeed in this you will gain a state department but you will most certainly lose a good university."[17]

At this critical period in history, our nation demands excellence in higher education. Restrictive practices can lead not only to a decrease in quality of programs built up over a long period of years, but also to inefficiency in management.

The problem remains, then, to find a means for determining when a device or technique for control, aimed at increasing efficiency, actually impinges upon the educational and research programs of the university. How can the governor and the legislature, in the process of budget-making for the state, avoid harmful interference with the making of decisions on educational policy by the university? When does the function of the auditor cease to serve the legitimate interest of the state and intrude upon the policy and program decisions made by those in the university directly responsible for its operation? At what point does the supervision of "housekeeping" details of finance and physical plant overreach itself and invade the educational responsibilities of the university administration? When do personnel controls cease providing a

[17] C. Clement French, "From the Viewpoint of a College President," *Proceedings of the Legislative Workshop on Financing Higher Education* (Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1958), p. 18.

service to the institution and the state and begin to be detrimental to education?

Assuming general agreement to the proposition that education must operate in freedom, when does that need begin to conflict, if at all, with the inescapable responsibilities of the officials of state government?

These and other questions must be resolved if state officials and educators are to perform their respective tasks effectively, in good will, and in a co-operative effort to meet the growing demand for higher education within the limited resources of the public treasury.

CHAPTER III

AVENUES OF REFORM

THE COMMITTEE approached with some misgivings the final phase of its assignment to frame proposals for improving relations between state government and public institutions of higher education. Neither state government nor our diverse system of higher education lends itself to easy generalization. Our system of higher education is complex, ranging from small teachers colleges to large, often autonomous, state universities; all are growing, evolving, changing. Each state government has its indigenous features, and each is growing, evolving, changing.

But the Committee is deeply convinced that basic principles of college-state relations should not change, and so it presents its recommendations with the hope that they will prove useful and acceptable to government officials and educators alike, and that, if viewed constructively, they may serve to aid both state government and public higher education in the accomplishment of their respective tasks.

The Committee is in unanimous agreement on this point: The essential freedom of higher education is wholly compatible with the effective operation of democratic government. Indeed, agencies of the state government and the state's educational institutions form an indispensable partnership, and help or harm to either affects all of society. Both share a common purpose—service to society, the constant advancement of human welfare.

23

If enduring improvements in the relations between government and higher education are to be effected, each must be willing to make adjustments and improvements in its operations. Because of the vigorous character of both government and higher education, some friction may remain even after changes have been made; but officials of both should admit that genuine efficiency of state government coincides with sound and responsible administration in higher education.

Because of the diversity of our system—from which, incidentally, both government and education derive their vigor—each state may find it necessary to modify any set of recommendations to suit its unique economic and political requirements. But we suggest that the general principles enunciated here are central to any revision of the law and administrative practices relating to public higher education.

WHAT HIGHER EDUCATION CAN DO

In our review of the administrative practices of colleges and universities, we sought to determine whether governing boards and educators were in fact operating their institutions effectively and responsibly. The overwhelming majority of governing board members have demonstrated great competence and conscience through an exacting period of educational history.

It is apparent that those institutions most successful in achieving a sound and harmonious relationship with the state government have built a foundation of confidence in their leadership. In good part this confidence rests on the fact that the president and trustees are willing to report openly and freely their use of public funds to legislators, state executives, and the public. Where secrecy exists, suspicion grows. Isolated cases of managerial backwardness or outright inefficiency are long remembered and widely recounted, and this in itself contributes materially to difficulties with state officials, not only for the offending institutions, but for others.

The Committee calls attention to the fact that in making the

following recommendations, however, it has drawn upon its observations of successful procedures at a number of outstanding institutions of higher education where administrative practices are obviously sound and efficient. Models of excellence in educational administration are to be found in all parts of the country.

1. *The Committee encourages academic officials, trustees, alumni, and all other individuals with an interest in higher education to make a strenuous effort to explain the case for independence of colleges and universities persuasively to state officials and the general public.* The Committee firmly believes that higher education requires a high degree of autonomy if it is to serve the best interests of society and the cause of higher learning. Ideally, a governing board of competent lay trustees for the institution should be empowered to assume full responsibility for its welfare and its operation. This is the best way for the state to assure itself of sound and efficient management in higher education. More influentially than any others, the members of university governing boards can be the persuasive spokesmen for institutional freedom. They speak as laymen to their fellow citizens and taxpayers. They have no "vested interest" in their positions as the university administrator sometimes, unfortunately, is presumed to have.

One point deserves emphasis: The essential intellectual freedom of higher education depends, in the last analysis, upon the institutional independence of our colleges and universities. In Chapter I of this report, the Committee has stated its convictions on the relationship of institutional and intellectual freedom in higher education. The Committee hopes that academic officials, trustees, alumni and all others with an interest in this area will carry their own concepts of the need for educational freedom to the general public.

2. *Colleges and universities should be candid and communicative in their dealing with state government.* Institutions which do not freely divulge pertinent information to legitimate public authorities, and to the public at large, are only inviting increased controls and compulsory reporting. Confidence is born of candor; a full and clear explanation of programs, costs, and actions serves not only to inform state officials and the public but to provide

assurance that the college or university is not concealing policies or activities which cannot stand inspection. The public and the state officials are entitled to have this evidence of the trusteeship of the governing board and administrative officers of the institution; and state officials must have such information if they are to make necessary fiscal decisions intelligently, in full awareness of the effect on the institution.

It is true, of course, that detailed information may occasionally be demanded for the apparent purpose of disrupting educational programs or harrassing university personnel, and such a political intrusion is thoroughly to be deplored. But, as an institution of the state, the university or college must meet its obligations to make a full disclosure of all information germane to public comprehension and public policy. This is particularly important in the area of costs, programs, and enrollment figures.

3. *Colleges and universities should make every effort to establish, maintain, and deserve a reputation for efficiency and sound management.* The Committee commends the many academic institutions which have shown leadership in developing modern administrative practices, but it recognizes that some state controls have been precipitated by deficiencies in college operations. Vigorous efforts to control costs in operation and capital outlay, constant comparison of program costs with the best institutions, and a readiness to adopt effective administrative techniques are indispensable if colleges and universities are to protect their freedom and avoid external interference. It is equally important that educational institutions develop sound techniques for advance planning and that they keep the public and state authorities advised of their plans and requirements for the future.

4. *Colleges and universities in each state should take the initiative in co-ordinating their programs effectively through voluntary and co-operative means.* Under the pressures of limited state resources and rising enrollments, it is imperative that state institutions avoid unnecessary duplication of programs. Competition for growth in numbers of students, prestige, or size of appropriations should never be allowed to lead to the establishment of facilities not needed or already available in ample magnitude elsewhere. There are many paths to effective co-ordination, and the choice of one depends on the special requirements of each state; but it

is a certainty that if academic activities are not co-ordinated by the institutions themselves, the state will feel compelled to step in and do the job. In some states, voluntary liaison mechanisms already exist which could be used for effective program co-ordination. In yet others, an official agency might be used for this purpose. As examples of successful practice, the Committee calls attention to the voluntary programs in Indiana and Ohio and to the effective co-ordinating boards of Oregon, Iowa, and Kansas. Oklahoma and New Mexico, with master boards that co-ordinate the activities of the regular governing boards, have also found a satisfactory method of operation. The same success has not attended the establishment of co-ordinating boards in some other states where through fiscal co-ordination they have failed to achieve sound educational co-ordination and have tended to deprive institutional governing boards of the indispensable sense of their own responsibility and authority.

Healthy competition among educational institutions has sparked noteworthy advances in research, teaching, and service to the community. Co-ordination need not be imposed in such a way that it stifles the creative energies of those in higher education. Under no circumstance should educational institutions permit the quality of their programs to be diminished; indeed, one of the aims of co-ordination should be to maintain and elevate standards of quality.

5. *Colleges and universities should avoid undertaking activities and offering courses that are not properly within the sphere of academic enterprise.* While many of the recent innovations in higher education—educational television, continuing education centers, and new degree programs—are legitimate extensions of academic endeavor, several institutions have embarked on ventures far removed from higher education. Legislatures themselves sometimes impose obligations on colleges and universities which have no direct relation to the educational or research program—often at the expense of the fundamental activities of the institutions.

While public institutions of higher learning recognize a duty to serve the people of the state, and have, in recent years, done massive amounts of defense research needed by the nation, the prime purposes of the institution must be kept clearly in mind.

Only as long as a college or university retains an academic outlook can it claim the autonomy to which an institution of higher education is entitled. If a school becomes largely a service enterprise, engaged in a far-flung range of nonacademic activities, it tends to lose identity as an institution of higher learning and can logically expect to be treated as just another governmental agency in respect to those activities.

6. *Governing boards of colleges and universities should assert their traditional authority to control the policies and operations of their institutions.* Ideally, it is through the mechanism of the institutional board of trustees that the state assures observance of the public responsibility of the institution. It is the trustees who are accountable to the state and to the people generally for the sound and frugal management of the institution and its programs. The Committee salutes the many distinguished governing board members who have maintained their positions as the legal guardians of higher education. Many state officials feel that governing boards have failed to live up to their responsibilities or have simply given up their legal right to govern when confronted with new controls from the state capitol. A reassertion of willingness and determination to handle all affairs of the institution would in some instances diminish the state's desire to regulate internal administration of the institution.

In Utah it has been found that power once lost is not easily recovered, for the courts there have held that the university's long-standing acquiescence to state control has given legitimacy to this supervision.

Trustees, particularly in the face of rising and falling tides of public opinion or specific political issues, have a difficult problem in standing firm to maintain the integrity and the freedom of their institutions. They are sometimes called upon to resist local and regional pressures which would restrict or require the admission of certain students, or require certain courses of study for the benefit of special interest groups, or limit the statement of opinions of staff members or visiting speakers. If the institution is to lay claim to intellectual freedom, its officials must exhibit their own devotion to the concept of freedom for those within the university community.

WHAT THE STATE CAN DO

The Committee commends the state administrations across the nation in which dedicated public servants have worked to produce both better government and better education. As in the preceding section, many of the recommendations listed here for improving state practices in relation to higher education are drawn from the experiences of forward-looking state government officials. Generalizations, of course, are rendered difficult by the complex interplay of law, custom and personality that characterizes government in the modern state. Recognizing, then, that each state has different needs and requirements, we offer these suggestions with the hope that they will ease the tasks of state government without sacrificing accountability and efficiency.

Legislatures

State legislatures, by their continued interest and support of higher education, deserve a large share of credit for the immense contribution made to society by public universities and colleges. This interest and support has been manifested in several ways:

By their authority as lawmakers, legislatures have established the pattern for public higher education which historically has been marked by a high degree of autonomy in academic affairs.

By their continued and increased financial support, legislatures have made possible a great and socially significant expansion in higher education.

The activities of individual legislators, legislative committees, and study groups have made substantial contributions to the advancement of education.

The basic issue that must be faced by legislatures—and likewise the general public—is the legal status that should be given to institutions of higher education. It is not too much to say that all other questions flow from this point.

In general, the Committee urges all state officials—executive and legislative—to recognize the boards of trustees of state colleges and universities as the responsible supervisors of our public institutions of higher learning; to look to such boards exclusively for the development of sound research and educational programs within the resources available, and to hold such boards responsible for the efficient management of public colleges and universities.

Some of our public colleges and universities enjoy constitutional autonomy; others do not but are protected from interference by statute. The Committee is strongly of the opinion that the American people will best be served if all institutions of higher education are treated as if they had legal autonomy, once their programs have been approved and their support determined by the legislature.

The Committee is deeply concerned about the legal status of higher education, and for this reason, after careful deliberation, submits the following recommendations:

1. *Legal autonomy should be given to every institution of higher education that carries on a substantial program of teaching and research.* This principle has been long and soundly established in the management of privately supported higher education. The Committee recommends either a constitutional amendment or a statute that would include the following provisions: (a) creation of an independent board for a single institution or related groups of institutions; (b) definition of the manner of selecting governing board members for overlapping terms of, say, six to nine years; (c) assignment to the board of full responsibility for the expenditure of funds allocated to the institution and for all internal policies of the institution; (d) requirement that the board submit full accounts of all financial and academic activities and be subject to a post-audit of its income and expenditures; (e) prohibition against interference by any state executive agency with the internal affairs of the institutions.[18]

[18] Some state-supported institutions, because of inadequate staff or the inability to guarantee a program and staff of excellence, may not be prepared for legal autonomy. But in all cases autonomy should be the ultimate objective, and states should actively work to strengthen the managerial and

2. *Legislatures are encouraged, when allocating funds to higher education, to avoid all attempts to legislate specifics of educational policy.* The Committee notes with satisfaction the trend away from the use of line-item appropriations which add to the work of the legislature and deprive educational institutions of managerial flexibility. We have found general satisfaction with appropriations made in a lump sum or by general categories. The Committee acknowledges some merit in an initial line-item appropriation for major innovations in the educational program, but suggests that these items should be included in the lump sum in subsequent appropriations. Such procedures would keep legislators well informed of developments in higher education without adding unnecessarily to the burdens of the legislative process.

3. *Legislative interim committees and service agencies should continue their valuable function of keeping legislatures informed, but they should never act as instruments of control over educational administration.* The Committee commends legislative councils and legislative survey commissions for excellent studies of higher education in many states. The Committee would point out, however, that some legislative agencies have unfortunately moved into the role of operational supervisors over certain activities on the college campus, particularly in capital outlay and pre-audit controls. This is not a function they are equipped to perform, for it is a task which demands professional decision and day-to-day knowledge of many of the institution's internal affairs. This is the responsibility of the educational administrator, and holding him accountable to his governing board for this function leads, in the long run, to sounder and more efficient management.

4. *The Committee encourages legislatures to review and revise those statutes pertaining to higher education and fiscal and management controls which have become outmoded or which impede the effective management of the institution by the responsible officers.* It is in a spirit of helpfulness to such efforts that the commendations in this section are presented. Many of the barriers to sound educational operation are caused by obsolete statutes or by laws of broad scope that have sometimes unintentionally included

---

educational capacities of smaller institutions so that they can assume their place as institutions of higher learning worthy of the name.

applications to institutions of higher education.[19] Revision and clarification of these laws could eliminate many practices that have caused difficulties between university officers and state executive agencies. A number of states are now undertaking general surveys of the nature and needs of higher education. These studies provide an opportunity for a reappraisal of the laws pertaining to higher education.

Governors

Most governors are scrupulous in keeping higher education out of politics. Indeed, in a great majority of states, the governor is a source of understanding and support for the state universities and colleges. The importance of the governor's office for higher education is marked in several ways: a high degree of authority is concentrated in the governor's hands; his personal staff is influential in state affairs; in most states he has authority to appoint board members and many state officials whose work is related to the state colleges and universities; he serves as ex-officio member on academic governing boards in several states, a role which often places him in close personal contact with higher education. This can be of benefit, but in some cases his membership has resulted in unfortunate political involvements or has drawn the governor into the position of having to arbitrate petty differences. But even in states where he does not sit on the board of trustees, the governor, more than any other state official, is in a position to improve the relationship between the state government and higher education. His influence within the executive arm of the state government is strong, and state officers, taking their cue from the attitude of the governor, can be encouraged to deal co-operatively with educators.

[19] Kentucky, for example, passed a statewide personnel act in 1950 and neglected to exempt higher education from its provisions even though there was no intention to apply state personnel procedures to colleges and universities. A clarification in a later session specifically established the independence of Kentucky's educational institutions in personnel affairs.

1. *The Committee calls attention to the fact that a large measure of the success of higher education will depend on the caliber of members serving on governing boards.* The point is perhaps obvious, but it deserves mention here, since governors have through their appointive power the opportunity to enhance the effectiveness of governing boards by appointing highly qualified members who will give dedicated service.[20] For the most part, the record of past performance of governing boards is exemplary. Gubernatorial appointees have usually been chosen with careful attention to their ability and their commitment to the cause of education. Now that colleges and universities are vast operations with complex and extensive responsibilities, the appointment of qualified persons assumes crucial importance.

2. *Governors are encouraged to survey the administrative controls over higher education and to issue administrative orders (where statutory changes are not required) to eliminate those that are unnecessary or harmful.*[21] Numerous regulations in purchasing, auditing, out-of-state travel, and budgeting are based on improper or unnecessarily rigid interpretations of law. The governor's influence can be brought to bear constructively against these misinterpretations of law. In addition, the governor's own office in several states is overburdened with administrative detail related to the institutions of higher education. Some states, for example, still lodge the responsibility for approval of out-of-state travel in the governor's office. This outmoded practice, and others like it, not only burdens the staff of the chief executive but creates

[20] Nearly three-quarters of all board members of public institutions of higher education are appointed by state governors. Another group—about 17 per cent—is chosen by public election or election by special groups. The remaining members serve ex officio. Some boards are entirely appointed or entirely elected, but others use mixed systems of selection.

See *Staff Report*, Chapters 10 and 12. For further statistical data see Council of State Governments, *Higher Education in the Forty-eight States* (Chicago, Council of State Governments, 1952), pp. 126–27.

[21] As an encouraging example, Michigan's Department of Administration, responsible directly to the governor, has taken positive steps to assign control over travel expenses to responsible agency heads who assume authority to make decisions within the limitations of budgetary allotments.

a serious administrative disadvantage for the colleges and universities.

3. *Governors are encouraged to exercise their influence to keep higher education out of any partisan conflict.* Political interference from any source is a grave danger to the integrity of higher education. From such encounters the institution can never benefit. In the long run public confidence in the institution is downgraded, and it is society which suffers from the damage done. The Committee commends the governors who have remained aloof from personal interference in the internal affairs of institutions of higher education and the state systems of colleges and universities.

Budgeting

The Committee recognizes the benefits of executive budgeting in state government. The state government has a right and duty to make certain that public funds are allocated effectively to meet the state's total needs, and specifically, to determine the share of the state's resources which shall be applied to higher education. At the same time, higher education has been placed in a difficult situation in several states under centralized budgeting techniques.

1. *Regarding higher education, the work of budget officers should be confined to: (a) analysis of the total budget requests; (b) recommendation to the governor of the total amount needed for higher education, along with the results of the budget analysis.* Budget officers should not have the authority to determine specific expenditures, fix individual salaries, or otherwise judge or alter educational programs or policies. The budget office can give its greatest service by insisting that educational institutions organize and arrange information in such a way that the governor and the legislature can readily comprehend the total program. Higher education can be harmed by the inversion of priorities or the overruling of professionally determined educational decisions by officials who are not familiar with the unique requirements of educational institutions. In situations where a budget office rec-

ommends a reduction in educational requests, the institutions should have the right to revise its distribution within the determined total.

2. *Officers and trustees of the institutions of higher education should have the right to defend their budgets before the governor and the legislature rather than to be forced to depend on a third party to present budget justifications on their behalf.*

3. *Annual allotments or full grants of appropriated funds are preferable to quarterly or monthly allotments for higher education.* The nature of higher education makes expenditures heavy at certain periods and light at others. Institutional officials, the persons with direct responsibility for management and operations, are best qualified to schedule their expenditures. (The Committee is of course aware that in some states the governor is required by law to withhold appropriations when the state is operating under deficit conditions.)

4. *In states which do not make lump-sum appropriations, colleges and universities should be given the maximum possible flexibility in the administration of funds, including authority to make essential transfers between categories in the budget.* In this connection, the Committee believes that it is sound to permit the institution itself to receive and manage its non-appropriated income, such as fees, thus permitting the use of such money in areas of greatest need. Budget transfers are least needed in those states where the college or university is permitted discretion in its use of non-appropriated income. In states where non-appropriated income is turned over to the state and re-appropriated, authority to make transfers is essential in the effort to achieve economical management and a balanced educational program. Needless to say, the educator in making transfers must act in good faith, never circumventing sound budgetary practice. But since educational management must contemplate rapidly changing enrollments, fluctuating research patterns, and innovation in educational practices, the college should not be held to rigid budget categories. The rapid expansion of college age population and the rise in numbers of those desiring advanced education are especially apt today to throw off the most carefully made estimates of enroll-

ment. An institution without flexibility in the use of its funds is hampered in meeting its responsibilities.[22]

Purchasing

Despite the reasonable purposes for which centralized state purchasing has been set up, the methods employed by some state purchasing agencies have impaired the efficient operation of colleges and universities. In some cases the impairment has been so extensive that the main objective of the purchasing system—maximum economy consistent with the responsibility of the institution—is actually not achieved. Excessive delays (sometimes months), arbitrary substitution of items of equipment in the orders, and in some cases what appears to be deliberate obstruction of academic purchases are the most common complaints where purchasing practices hamper the college. The Committee has been pleased to note the number of state purchasing agents who view their assignment as one of service. It is also gratifying to have reports that some states are by regulations or statute assuring that orders for scientific equipment are not given the same sort of screening as is given to routine purchases of supplies.

Educators must acknowledge a difference in nature between those procedural requirements which are annoying or waste time and energy without in fact achieving the intended savings, and those which actually impede the educational program. This is a line too fine to be drawn accurately for all local situations in the framework of one definition, and so the Committee has based its recommendations on broad general principles. In so doing, it has kept uppermost the realization that its recommendations must be balanced, reasonable, and consistent with the requirements of both state and higher education. It believes that the following recommendations will have applicability throughout the country:

[22] Inability to make transfers may not only hamper the university in meeting legitimate and sometimes urgent expenditures but may actually result in increased cost due to lack of flexibility. For fuller discussion of such experiences, see *Staff Report*, Chap. 4.

1. *Colleges and universities should be encouraged, where savings will result, to make voluntary use of state purchasing services, but they should be exempted from compulsory centralized state purchasing.* The Committee agrees with purchasing officials that commodities used throughout the state government may often be purchased more economically by means of centralized, scheduled buying;[23] it believes on the other hand that certain purchases can best be made by the institutions themselves, both in terms of savings and the effectiveness of the educational program. Educators frequently complain that delays experienced through central purchasing are harmful to their educational and research programs. It is especially important that institutions should be given full discretion in the selection of scientific equipment, and teaching and research materials. The Committee would favor the voluntary use of state purchasing procedures where the institutions' administrators believe this will prove economical and otherwise helpful.

2. *Purchases made by institutions should be in conformity with modern purchasing procedures, including open and competitive bidding for large items and bulk purchasing.*[24] In this connection, the Committee would look with favor on uniform legislation setting standards to be observed by agencies receiving their funds from the state. Even in the absence of such uniform legislation, the state universities and colleges should expect to make their practices conform with those which are established and approved by statute or regulation.

Auditing

While the post-audit of accounts is an accepted and necessary practice in any governmental activity, the practice of requiring

[23] This is not always the case, of course, for in large universities such quantities are purchased that favorable prices can often be negotiated even on routine items.

[24] It should be noted that competitive bidding will not always result in savings—for example, in cases when only a few companies can bid or when certain commodity prices are fairly rigid. Where public bidding is not used, the trustees should make certain of the propriety of the procedures.

a pre-audit of all expenditures of public funds has proved to be cumbersome and disruptive when it is applied to the special activity of higher education. In some states the pre-audit has been improperly used as a means to substitute the judgment of the pre-auditor for the decisions of education officials authorized by governing boards.

1. *The Committee reaffirms the need for a thorough post-audit of the expenditures of institutions of higher education.* This audit should be kept as current as practicable and should be a factual reporting of financial conditions to the public.

2. *The pre-audit should not be applied to higher education.* The Committee doubts the value of the external pre-audit as it has been applied to higher education. Governing boards and college administrators should be prepared to assume full responsibility for expenditures. If for legal reasons higher education in some states cannot now be exempted from the pre-audit (such laws should be changed as soon as possible), it is urgent that pre-auditors exercise only ministerial power in the approval of proposed academic expenditures. A few arbitrary pre-audit decisions can cause critical damage to a research program before its value is apparent to the outsider, and well laid educational plans can be emasculated by an inability to purchase appropriate equipment.[25] In no case should a state pre-auditor question the wisdom of the expenditure—only its legality.

Personnel

Nowhere are the unique requirements of higher education more apparent than in personnel administration. State personnel

[25] Before Iowa abolished the pre-audit of higher educational expenditures, the auditor at one institution balked at the approval of funds for the operation of the state bacteriological laboratory. Despite clear evidence that the expenditures were part of a planned educational program, the auditor decided that the expenditures were mainly designed to use up funds at the end of a fiscal year. The university won its case, but only after costly delays and negotiation with the central office. The pre-audit and certification are discussed extensively in *Staff Report*, Chap. 5.

controls over institutions have worked great hardships in higher education without compensating benefits. Most of these personnel controls have appeared in what is unfortunately called the "nonacademic" area. All work on the college campus is in one way or another directly related to the institution's academic activity. Only the most routine labor and clerical work is interchangeable with that of noneducational institutions. The importance of recognizing the academic character of much work outside the classroom cannot be overstressed.

1. *If a university is to fulfill its mission, autonomy in the control of both academic and nonacademic staff is by far the preferred arrangement.* If the university is to explore new areas of knowledge, to produce creative research, and to contribute to the education of students and enlightenment of citizens, the optimum situation for such achievement will be found on the campus where the governing board and the administration are free to establish and direct personnel policies. Certainly state personnel controls should never be imposed on the selection, tenure, or dismissal of faculty members. The trustees and administration ought always to be able to recruit, promote, and dismiss faculty personnel in accord with accepted and well established educational practice.

2. *A high responsibility rests upon the colleges themselves to use the most effective personnel practices in their own employment programs.* With an eye always to the major objectives of higher education, colleges should survey their own employment practices, among both faculty and staff, to determine salary inequities (taking into account differences in ability and special qualifications) and inconsistencies in hiring and promotion.

Here again is a case in which the service of the state personnel officer may be very helpful to the college administrator, especially in a small institution. The Committee would favor the college's being able to use these services on a voluntary basis.

Until state personnel controls are removed from higher education the Committee offers these interim remedial measures:

1. *Initially, the personnel agency should solicit the counsel of the educational institution to determine actual needs in person-*

nel and to offer a candid evaluation of the ability of the personnel agency to meet those needs. Thereafter, the personnel agency should wherever possible follow the recommendations of the college in writing job descriptions and fixing salary scales. When a college presents evidence that a job has unique requirements, even though it may appear unorthodox, the needs of the college should be respected, and the burden of proof for rejection should lie with the personnel agency.

2. *Rules and procedures should be made as flexible as possible.* If colleges and universities are to fulfill faithfully the mission of educational institutions, college administrators should have discretion to seek out capable personnel, to make definite commitments as to salary and promotion with freedom to exceed the minimum levels, and to remove the unfit. The amount appropriated to the university, of course, sets the general financial limits on the freedom of the college officials to hire and promote employees.

3. *Colleges and universities should not be required to follow civil service procedures when these procedures are of no real assistance in locating scarce employees.* The Committee would urge the state personnel agency to be as liberal as possible in interpreting regulations as applied to institutions of higher education and to establish exempt categories of positions for universities and colleges where they are needed. The major fault of personnel control in the past is that it has subjected academic institutions to an elaborate system of controls and procedures without giving them the services set forth in the objectives of a personnel program. Indeed many educational institutions have been required to do a major share of the administrative work that supposedly was the task of the personnel agency.[26] In such circumstances, the system becomes a real handicap to the institution.

[26] Cumbersome procedures in one eastern state caused an institution once to interview twenty-six candidates for a single clerical position, and each time the institution had to repeat complex reporting procedures on the outcome of each interview. In a midwestern state, the institutions must still hire a large percentage of their own personnel because of empty civil service rosters of eligible employees. For a further discussion, see *Staff Report*, Chap. 7.

Building

The development of central state building agencies represents a new and complex phase of state control over capital programs. These agencies, sometimes called building divisions or building authorities, act as administrative instruments of the state executive, or occasionally are responsible to the legislature. While great diversity exists in their purposes, procedures, and practices, the following comments seem generally applicable.

Until the end of World War II, most college and university construction projects were carried forward by the institutions, working directly with the contractors. But increasingly since then colleges and universities in many states have been required to submit all plans for clearance by a central building agency or to turn over to the agency full responsibility for design and construction of campus buildings.

From the point of view of state officials, the concept of a central construction and design agency has considerable merit. A pool of experts who stand ready to help institutions with their physical plant problems is, in fact, an encouraging development in modern state government. In some instances, however, building agencies have disrupted campus building programs or have arbitrarily substituted their judgments on educational building needs for those of the college president and his staff. As long as central building agencies remain in the role of advisory and service agencies, the Committee feels that the difficult matter of construction and design can be materially improved on the college campus. When they depart from this relationship they tend to intrude upon matters which bear directly on educational policy.

1. *Since higher education represents a substantial share of the capital outlay program of most states, the Committee recognizes the necessity for requests of colleges and universities to be coordinated in a statewide capital program.* Institutions must expect to present long-range building plans to be worked into the general state building program. The work of a building agency provides a useful service to the legislature, which retains au-

thority for final decision, or to the executive branch of government in administering the use of appropriated funds.

2. *Colleges and universities should utilize, on a voluntary basis, the services and advice of central building agencies whenever their own architectural and engineering staffs are not adequate to handle building programs.* This is particularly important for small colleges. Larger universities normally have expert staffs fully competent to handle building programs.

3. *Central building agencies should encourage space utilization studies but should not have authority to allocate space on the campus.* Difficulties have arisen when building agencies have themselves undertaken space utilization studies which did not take into account the special requirements of colleges and universities. Space utilization in other state agencies is not similar to that in educational plants, and thus these studies are best undertaken by the staff of the institution itself. However, small colleges may find it convenient to request technical assistance from the central agency in making these studies.

GENERAL

Although good intentions are evident on both sides, the Committee notes with regret that there is still an unfortunate lack of meaningful communication between state officials and higher education in some states. Contact between state officials and educators is usually amicable, and most problems of state control never reach an impasse. Yet these contacts are often limited to the solution of single and immediate technical problems and do not reach the deeper causes of disagreement. To increase this mutual understanding, these following comments and suggestions are offered:

The Committee would encourage states or regions to hold conferences or workshops concerned with the relationships of state government and higher education, either on a broad scale or in specific fields of activity. Such conferences would permit the exchange of points of view and consultation on problems indigenous to the

geographical area. They would also present an opportunity to discuss procedures and practices used successfully in other parts of the country. Such meetings would supplement the excellent work being carried on by such regional organizations as the Southern Regional Education Board, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, and the New England Board of Higher Education—and might be carried out in co-operation with these and other organizations concerned with promoting fruitful contacts between state and college officials. Assistance in planning meetings and securing expert consultants or speakers might be sought from the Association of Governing Boards, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the State Universities Association, the Council of State Governments, and other national organizations with interests in this area.

Some urgency attaches itself to achieving a harmonious and fruitful working partnership between the officials of state government and educators, for the heralded "tidal wave" of students is nearly upon our colleges and universities. There is also a critical and widely acknowledged need for ever-increasing quality in our educational programs and research in all fields of study. All the talents, energies, and wisdom of professionals in education and officials in state government will be called upon to solve these substantive problems. If we are wise, we shall act soon to establish co-operative relationships, for it would be wasteful to halt educational progress while we spend time settling matters of jurisdiction and procedure.

The Committee feels that a sincere quest for understanding might lay the basis for enduring solutions to the common problems faced by state government and institutions of higher education. Obviously, a renewal of confidence and mutual respect is necessary as the basis for better relations between the state and higher education. Although state and regional meetings can lay the groundwork for improved relations between the state and higher education, the key to understanding is to be found in the tenor of daily working relations. A great deal more can be done to familiarize state officials with the special problems of a uni-

versity. All too often contacts are limited to occasions when disputes arise.

The Committee is convinced that college officials frequently underestimate the interest of state officials, particularly legislators, in the real functions of higher education. Far too often the assumption is made that the legislators' interest extends only to football games or pet projects. By the same token, state officials carry with them an unjustified stereotype of colleges as being ivory towers and their leadership as being uninterested in business efficiency. Neither of these unflattering images is at all accurate, and both should be laid to rest.

The deeper the Committee went into the study of the multiplicity of problems inherent in the relations of the state governments and the public institutions of higher education, the more firmly its members became convinced that more is involved here than mere amicability between educators and political leaders. Some vital principles of freedom for education are involved.

It is apparent that a potential threat of damage to these principles is always present. Neither educators nor government officials would willingly countenance turning over our educational institutions to political control. But when they condone the imposition of intrusive controls of any sort, they open the way to an erosive process which first can weaken and then destroy the essential freedom of the state colleges and universities.

The consensus of the Committee is that this freedom is preserved and strengthened by the granting of independence to the institution and—it cannot be emphasized strongly enough—by placing responsibility and authority for the management of the institution in the hands of an able, independent lay board of trustees, who themselves can be held accountable to the people of the state for wise and effective action. Only by insuring the preservation of freedom and independence of our public institutions of higher learning can we make certain that they will continue to exist as creative centers of learning and research contributing much, as they always have, to human progress.

American Association of
State Colleges and Universities

One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-7070

Allan W. Ostar
President